

RECEIVED
JUN 16 2009

WEST SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
15873 HWY 67, RAMONA, CA 92065
RAMONA COMMUNITY CENTER
434 AQUA LANE, RAMONA
April 29, 2009, 7:00 P.M.

San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

1. CALL TO ORDER – 7:15
2. DETERMINATION OF MEMBERS PRESENT – Consideration Will be Given to Members Who Have Missed Consistently. They Will Be Removed And Will Need to Reapply for Membership

Members Present: Kristi Mansolf, Chair; George Boggs, Dennis Grimes, Kareen Madden

Excused Absence: Jeff Lachine

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS – None
4. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

Mr. Boggs addressed 4 non-agenda items. (1) The Highland Valley Ranch project is pursuing water for the project, so it's moving forward. He asked if there had been any information on the project lately? The project is a 300 increase in density and development over what is there now. He believes the RCPG denied this MUP expansion. The owner wants to build a package treatment plant. Montecito Ranch is also talking about having a package treatment plant. The RMWD won't accept/operate it if they do. The RMWD is going to expand the Santa Maria Treatment Plant. He would like to know the status of the Highland Valley Ranch project. (2) The RMWD does not want the road in the Fund for Animals project to be paved. They are checking to see if this is feasible. The Planning Commission addressed the issue of secondary access as a requirement for new development. The RMWD is also checking on whether there is a possible secondary access for the Fund for Animals with what exists on the site. (3) Mr. Boggs announced that a pathway requirement recommended by the RCPG for the Station 82 remodel cost \$20,000 and the RMWD will pay to develop and maintain the pathway, including watering the landscaping. This cost will filter down to the ratepayers. The cost doesn't include the IOD. Right now, there is not other trail in the immediate area. (4) Many CHP's are currently patrolling Hwy 67 and pulling people over.

Action Items:

5. PAA 09-001, Ramona Retail Center. Hwy 67 at Ramona Maria Lane. Coast Income Properties, Applicant. 53 Acres. Proposing a Change from Semi Rural 10 (GP Update), Intensive Agriculture 19 (Current) to General Commercial C-1 (GP Update), General

Commercial C-36 (Current)

Ms. Mansolf announced that the applicant did not want to come to any subcommittee meetings without a plan to review. Because the RCPG received the PAA, the item was put on the agenda. DPLU has made a decision already to deny the PAA, not due to the merits of the project, but because the GP Update is so far along, they are denying all PAA's. The applicant can appeal the decision to the Planning Commission, and if this fails, to the Board of Supervisors. Target is not involved at this time. The proponents will make a presentation at the RCPG meeting. The County says they want the RCPG comments, but asked it not go to the subcommittees, too. The applicant wants to talk about the project at the May meeting, then have a Community meeting, then come back to the RCPG and subcommittees after they have designed a plan that reflects what the community wants. Should anyone want to share their opinion on this project, bring them to the RCPG meeting May 7.

6. Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for Montecito Road SC 931, General Plan Amendment; PWA-00199. Amendment to Circulation Element of San Diego County General Plan to Remove a Segment of Montecito Road Starting Approximately 1000 feet West of Montecito Way and Continuing West Approximately 8,700 feet (1.65) Miles to Rangeland Road. Available at:

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/environment/envrnsvcs.html>

This item has been recently before the RCPG and T&T Subcommittees. For vacating the road, the County is looking into the possibility of making an emergency evacuation road north of the Airport that will be gated.

Mr. Grimes wants a sound plan in place for an alternative road before he can support vacating Montecito Road. Mr. Boggs agrees. They don't believe Ramona will get an emergency evacuation road if Montecito Road vacated. Ms. Mansolf feels the County has already demonstrated commitment for the emergency evacuation road, which may also be used as a trail. It is being investigated now.

MOTION: TO DENY THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE COUNTY PROVIDES A VIABLE EMERGENCY ACCESS ROAD.

Motion made by George Boggs and seconded by Dennis Grimes. Motion passed 3-1-0-0-1, with Kristi Mansolf voting no and Jeff Lachine absent.

7. Draft Landscape Ordinance (POD 08-016) Proposed Amendment will Establish a Landscape Water Budget and Water Use Authorization, the Submittal of Landscape and Irrigation Plans Demonstrating Adherence to the Water Budget, Installation of Water Submeters to Assist in Monitoring Landscape Water Use, a Requirement to Use Recycled Water for Irrigation if Available, and Enforcement Capability

Mr. Boggs said the CWA has sent out a Level II Drought Alert. There will be an 8 percent cutback to the RMWD from the CWA from last year. If you installed a new watering system last year that cut your water usage 20 percent, you are still going to be required to cut back another 8 percent starting this year.

Ms. Mansolf said the County's Draft Landscape Ordinance public review period ends May 4, but the County said they will still accept the RCPG comments from the May 7 meeting. The County Ordinance is intended to reflect State law and new, more stringent requirements on water usage. The Ordinance applies to new development and additions of water features to existing development that are 50 sq ft or greater (like a swimming pool).

Mr. Boggs said that there is no recycled water in Ramona. There is tertiary treated water at the San Vicente Golf Course, in Highland Valley, Spangler Ranch and the Mt. Woodson Golf Course

Comments:

- A financial impact statement should be included in the ordinance.
- Five new permits will be required just for landscaping and water usage. These permits will be very costly. Five permits is excessive.
- Five different professionals, such as licensed civil engineers and landscape architects will have to be hired to get the job done. This will be very costly. Hiring five separate engineers/professionals is excessive
- Concerns with the County's right to inspect clause.
- There is no discussion about the interface between water districts.
- There is redundancy between the County requirements, the State requirements, and what the RMWD will be requiring when they write their Ordinance in keeping with the law.
- There is redundancy between permit requirements that are already in place, such as grading permits and the Draft Landscape Ordinance.
- Submeters are required.

The cost will add significantly to the high cost already to develop in the County.

MOTION: TO SEND COMMENTS.

Motion made by George Boggs and seconded by Kristi Mansolf. The Motion passed 3-0-0-0-2, with Jeff Lachine and Kareen Madden absent.

8. Corrections/Approval to the Minutes 1-28-09, 3-31-09 – Not Addressed

9. Adjournment – 8:30

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf